



Tuesday, 26 September 1950, at 3 p.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Adoption of the agenda: report of the General Committee (<i>concluded</i>).....	113
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	119
Speeches by Mr. Uden (Sweden), Mr. Siroky (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Urdaneta Arbeláez (Colombia)	

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

Adoption of the agenda: report of the General Committee (A/1386) (*concluded*)

[Agenda item 8]

PART I (*continued*)

Items 26 to 29 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Are there any objections to the inclusion in the agenda of item 30 on freedom of information, including sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c)?

2. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet Union delegation considers that sub-paragraph (b) of item 30 of the provisional agenda, which deals with the so-called question of "interference with radio signals" should not be included in the agenda of the present session. We object to the inclusion of this question in the Assembly's agenda for the reasons which we shall enumerate.

3. As you all know, this question was discussed by the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press at its session in Montevideo, Uruguay, and also by the eleventh session of the Economic and Social Council in Geneva this summer. Both these United Nations bodies discussed the question and adopted recommendations on it at a time when they were illegally constituted. For perfectly valid and clearly understood reasons the representatives of the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia did not participate in the work of these bodies. The representatives of the Chinese People's Republic were also absent from those sessions, because they were deprived of any possibility of taking part in the work of those bodies as a result of the illegal position adopted by certain States with regard to the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations.

4. The USSR delegation has already stated on several occasions that decisions and recommendations adopted by United Nations bodies while they are illegally constituted and with the participation of the representative of the Kuomintang group are illegal and that the Soviet Union does not recognize the validity of such decisions and recommendations.

5. It is quite clear, moreover, from the records and resolutions of the sessions of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Economic and Social Council to which I have referred, that what is really involved in the alleged "interference with radio signals" is an attempt to spread gross slanders about certain countries. Those who sponsor the inclusion of this item in the provisional agenda are obviously trying to involve the General Assembly in aimless and fruitless debates and discussion on the question so as to be able to intervene in the domestic affairs of States and to bring pressure to bear on countries.

6. It is obvious that such unnecessary and harmful discussions of questions which fall within the internal jurisdiction of States would directly impede the development and strengthening of international relations, which is the reason for which the delegations of the fifty-nine States Members of the United Nations have gathered together at this session of the General Assembly.

7. For these reasons, while the delegation of the Soviet Union has no objection to a debate on the item on freedom of information or the inclusion of sub-paragraphs (a), "Draft convention on freedom of information", and (c), "Question of the freedom of information and of the Press in times of emergency", it does object to the inclusion in the agenda of sub-paragraph (b), "Interference with radio signals".

8. The USSR delegation therefore submits these objections to the General Assembly for consideration at its present session.

9. Mr. SKOROBOGATY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is in agreement with and supports the Soviet Union delegation's proposal that item 7 of the supplementary list of items should not be included in the agenda of the General Assembly and that this item should not be linked with item 30 of the provisional agenda under the general heading of "Freedom of information". I am referring to section I, subparagraph iv (b), entitled "Interference with radio signals", of the General Committee's report.

10. The question of alleged "interference with radio signals" has already been discussed by the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and the Press at Montevideo; from the discussion there it is clear that both the formulation of the question and its interpretation by the representatives of certain States were tendentious and had no bearing whatsoever on true freedom of information.

11. During the discussion of this question at its eleventh session in Geneva, the Economic and Social Council repeated in substance the same biased and slanderous fabrications about certain States which had already been heard in the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information.

12. The recommendations adopted on this question in resolution 306 (XI) of the Economic and Social Council are incorrect in substance and were adopted while the Council was illegally constituted, that is to say, in the absence of the representatives of the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia and also of the representative of the Chinese People's Republic. Those decisions cannot therefore be recognized as legal, nor can they be considered by the General Assembly.

13. It is obvious to everyone that the people who are raising this question in the General Assembly and in other United Nations bodies are attempting to involve the General Assembly in idle and fruitless debates on a tendentious question which clearly constitutes interference in the internal affairs of States.

14. There is no doubt that such unnecessary and harmful discussion of questions falling within the internal jurisdiction of States is completely alien to the development and strengthening of international co-operation, that it is directed against such co-operation and is in contradiction with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

15. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR does not object to the item on freedom of information or to the inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly of subparagraphs (a) and (c) of that item; but, for the reasons that I have explained, it does object to the inclusion of subparagraph (b) on the alleged "interference with radio signals".

16. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I do not intend to discuss here whether or not the General Assembly should consider the resolution of the Economic and Social Council which has been objected to by the delegation of the Soviet Union. Representatives will judge that question for themselves. I wish to comment only on the statements made here regarding the illegality of this resolution. It has been claimed that

the resolution is illegal because it was originally submitted by the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and then adopted by the Economic and Social Council; in the opinion of the USSR representatives, these organs were not legally competent to act owing to the absence of certain of their members.

17. With regard to the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information, I would remind you that its members were elected by the Commission on Human Rights. The legality of the presence in the Sub-Commission of a person of any given nationality, who has been duly elected, cannot be challenged on any ground whatsoever.

18. With respect to the alleged illegality of the resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its 10th and 11th sessions, I should like to place on record that such a contention is entirely unacceptable to my delegation, as it was to the Economic and Social Council itself, and will be, I trust, to the great majority of representatives in this Assembly. The fact that three delegations refused, of their own free will, to take part in the Council's proceedings, cannot deprive the Council's resolutions of legal force. The Charter contains no provision which can be invoked by the USSR representative to support his contentions. Moreover, rule 13 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly provides that our provisional agenda shall include, among other questions, the items proposed by the Economic and Social Council.

19. In this case, the Council recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a certain resolution. No precedent exists for the Assembly refusing to discuss a recommendation or proposal of any of the principal organs of the United Nations, organs which share with the Assembly the responsibility for dealing with questions entrusted to the Organization by the Charter.

20. For these reasons, my delegation emphatically upholds the legality of the resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council, and requests the Assembly to overrule the objections of the USSR representative.

21. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Since there are no objections to subparagraphs (a) and (c) of item 30, on freedom of information, I shall put subparagraph (b) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph (b) was placed on the agenda by 45 votes to 5, with one abstention.

22. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall now put item 30 as a whole to the vote.

Item 30 as a whole was placed on the agenda by 45 votes to 5.

Items 31 to 56 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

23. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We have now reached item 57, reading "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa".

24. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): I wish to reserve my Government's position with regard to this particular item. When the draft agenda was being considered by the General Committee, I was permitted to state formally¹ my Government's objection to the in-

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, General Committee, 69th meeting.*

clusion in that agenda of the item, "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa".

25. As on previous occasions, this objection was based on the fact that, since the treatment in the Union of South Africa of South African nationals who are of Indian or, for that matter, of any other origin, is essentially a domestic matter, the United Nations is precluded by the explicit provision of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter from assuming any jurisdiction in regard thereto. The arguments which have been adduced in the past in support of the South African Government's view have been included in the records and are well known. I need not, therefore, repeat them now, apart from pointing out that Article 2, paragraph 7, on which my Government bases its objection, contains one of the most fundamental provisions of the Charter and was plainly intended to have an overriding effect.

26. The draft agenda is now before this Assembly and contains the item dealing with this question. As I intimated to the General Committee, it is necessary for me to safeguard the position of my Government at all stages; it is therefore necessary that I now again state formally that the Government of the Union of South Africa maintains its view that the General Assembly is precluded by the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter from dealing with the item in question. I must request that this fact should be placed on record, as well as the fact that I have reserved my Government's position in the matter.

27. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The reservations contained in the statement just made by the representative of the Union of South Africa will of course be included in the record of this meeting.

Items 57 to 61 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

28. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We have now reached item 62, reading "Relations of States Members and specialized agencies with Spain."

29. Mr. HERRERA BAEZ (Dominican Republic) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of the Dominican Republic will vote in favour of placing on the agenda of the fifth session the item concerning the relations of Member States and specialized agencies with Spain.

30. Accordingly my delegation confirms the position it adopted in the General Committee,² where it stated that, since 1946, the change in circumstances rendered the question of relations with Spain worthy of reconsideration, and that it was therefore necessary to consider the question of the resumption of such relations at the current session of the Assembly.

31. The General Committee has now recommended the inclusion of this item in the Assembly's agenda. My delegation therefore endorses the General Committee's view on this point and will support its recommendation.

32. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): The General Committee, acting on the request of the delegations of the Dominican Republic [A/1310] and Peru, [A/1328] has decided by a majority vote to include in the agenda of the present session the item concerning the relations

of Member States of this Organization with Spain, as well as the relations between the specialized agencies and Spain. We all understand quite well that the intention of those who have moved the inclusion of this item is to force upon this Organization a different attitude to the one which was previously adopted both by the United Nations and by the specialized agencies, as well as at several international conferences.

33. The representative of the Dominican Republic stated that certain changes had to be taken into consideration. If we review the situation which exists at the moment, we shall see that the ostracism imposed by this Organization upon the fascist regime of Franco in Spain has been based on certain facts and certain findings, and nothing that has happened between 1945 and the present time has proved these findings to have been wrong or wrongly interpreted.

34. I should like to recall to the members of the General Assembly that the investigating Sub-Committee on the Spanish question³ came to the conclusion, after long study, that the Spanish situation was one which had already "led to international friction" and that the existence and the activities of the Franco regime constituted "a situation likely to endanger international peace and security." The sub-committee of the Security Council established the fascist character of the Franco regime and its close connexion with Nazi Germany and fascist Italy.

35. The second part of the first session of the General Assembly, which dealt with this problem, had a full-dress discussion and, after endless changes and manoeuvres, adopted resolution 39 (I) which, although mild and watered-down, nevertheless established the following facts:

"(a) In origin, nature, structure and general conduct, the Franco regime is a fascist regime patterned on, and established largely as a result of aid received from, Hitler's Nazi Germany and Mussolini's fascist Italy.

"(b) During the long struggle of the United Nations against Hitler and Mussolini, Franco, despite continued Allied protests, gave very substantial aid to the enemy Powers. . .

"(c) Incontrovertible documentary evidence establishes that Franco was a guilty party with Hitler and Mussolini in the conspiracy to wage war against those countries which eventually in the course of the world war became banded together as the United Nations. It was part of the conspiracy that Franco's full belligerency should be postponed until a time to be mutually agreed upon."

36. The General Assembly, acting on the basis of these facts, none of which has been proved to be wrong, stated that the fascist government of Franco "was imposed by force upon the Spanish people with the aid of the Axis Powers" and that it "gave material assistance to the Axis Powers in the war". The General Assembly further stated that the Franco Government "does not represent the Spanish people, and by its continued control of Spain is making impossible the

³ For the Sub-Committee's report, see *Official Records of the Security Council, first year, first series, Special Supplement* (revised edition).

² *Ibid.*

participation of the Spanish people with the peoples of the United Nations in international affairs.”

37. The General Assembly therefore recommended as follows: “. . . that the Franco Government of Spain be debarred from membership in international agencies established by or brought into relationship with the United Nations, and from participation in conferences or other activities which may be arranged by the United Nations or by these agencies, until a new and acceptable government is formed in Spain”.

38. That same resolution continued as follows:

“The General Assembly,

“Further, desiring to secure the participation of all peace-loving peoples, including the people of Spain, in the community of nations,

“Recommends that if, within a reasonable time, there is not established a government which derives its authority from the consent of the governed . . . the Security Council consider the adequate measures to be taken in order to remedy the situation.”

39. As a first step, it was recommended that ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary be recalled from Madrid.

40. This is the situation as it exists today. This is a continuation of the first steps taken at the Potsdam Conference, at which it was stated that the Spanish Government had been founded with the support of the Axis Powers. At the San Francisco Conference also, at the request of the Mexican delegation, it was decided to bar for the future any relations between the United Nations and states whose regimes, in the words of the Mexican resolution, “have been established with the help of the military forces belonging to the countries which have waged war against the United Nations, as long as those regimes are in power”.

41. General Assembly resolution 39 (I), concerning the recall of ambassadors and ministers, and which bars the participation of the Franco fascist government in the specialized agencies, was based on certain facts and findings. During the many discussions of this question that have taken place, we have not heard that any of the facts stated by the sub-committee of the Security Council or by the General Assembly have been proved to be wrong.

42. The General Assembly, which decided to take action against the Franco Government, made it possible to reconsider the item under either of two conditions: first, if a new and acceptable government were formed in Spain; second, if the Security Council, within a reasonable time, considered that no change had occurred and wanted to adopt stronger measures which would lead to the downfall of the Franco Government.

43. At the very beginning of the United Nations and during the conferences of the Allies prior to the conclusion of the war, the freeing of the Spanish people from the regime which had been imposed upon them was considered a part of the war aims of the Allies. It was so considered because of the character and the origin of the Franco regime.

44. As we have stated, those facts have not changed.

What changes have come about which have brought the Franco lobbyists, in the persons of the representatives of Peru and of the Dominican Republic, to request this Assembly to change its rightful attitude adopted in the year 1946—to change it and not proceed with stronger measures? Surely, none of those delegations can prove to us that the character of that regime is not fascist, that it was not established with the aid of the Axis Powers, and that it was not waging war against the Allies.

45. Certain machinations mentioned in certain memoirs of ambassadors and statesmen, which no doubt some of the delegations here will bring forth in this debate, do not justify any change in our attitude; neither does the new strategic design of the United States in Europe, which sees in Franco Spain a base for its expansion, justify a change in our attitude. The attitude of the United Nations towards Franco Spain cannot be established on the basis of the desires of the commercial travellers for Coca-Cola or of the Pentagon. The attitude of the United Nations towards the Franco regime must be decided by the duty of this Organization towards the people of Spain, which were promised at San Francisco and at Potsdam that they would be freed from the yoke imposed by the bloody regime of Franco.

46. In view of the fact that this item does not contain a request in accordance with the resolution passed in 1946 to consider adequate measures to remedy the situation, but tries to bring the Franco regime in through the back door, first, into the specialized agencies and then into the United Nations, my delegation will therefore oppose the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

47. Mr. VOYNA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The United Nations has repeatedly censured Franco's political regime, in particular at San Francisco, at the Potsdam Conference between the heads of the three great Powers in 1945, and subsequently during the first and second sessions of the General Assembly.

48. It is important that we should not forget resolutions 39 (I) and 114 (II) adopted by the General Assembly on 12 December 1946 and 17 November 1947, respectively to which the representative of Poland has referred in detail.

49. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR therefore sees no reason whatsoever for the consideration at this time of the question of relations with Spain since there is at present absolutely no need or reason to consider it. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR warmly supports the proposal of the delegation of Poland that this question should be excluded from the agenda.

50. Mr. BABAHOJAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): During the debate in the General Committee as to which of the items proposed by the Secretary-General in the provisional agenda of the current session should or should not be included in the agenda, the USSR delegation objected to and voted against the inclusion of the question of Spain.

51. Now that the report of the General Committee is being considered by the General Assembly in plenary meeting, the delegation of the Soviet Union deems it necessary to restate its objection to the inclusion of this

⁴ See *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organizations*, 3rd and 4th meetings of Commission I, documents 1167 I/10 and 1186 I/12.

question in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly.

52. The USSR delegation objects to the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly in any form whatsoever, because there is absolutely no reason for such inclusion. The question of Spain was settled some time ago at one of the previous sessions. Nothing has occurred since to warrant a review of this question, and the Soviet Union delegation therefore sees no reason to keep it on the agenda of the present session.

53. The USSR delegation therefore supports the proposal submitted by Poland and will vote against the inclusion of the question of Spain in the agenda of the General Assembly.

54. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If there are no other comments, I shall put item 62 to the vote.

Item 62 was placed on the agenda by 45 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

Items 63 to 66 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

55. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We now come to item 67, reading "Complaint of failure on the part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to repatriate or otherwise account for prisoners of war detained in Soviet territory".

56. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The inclusion in the agenda of the question of the repatriation from the Soviet Union of Japanese and German prisoners of war is proposed in the report of the General Committee. The question has slanderous implications and its inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly would be contrary to Article 107 of the United Nations Charter which precludes the introduction and consideration of such questions in United Nations organs.

57. Article 107 states that "nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any State which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the Governments having responsibility for such action".

58. Moreover, it is a matter of common knowledge that the repatriation of German and Japanese prisoners of war from the Soviet Union was completed long ago, and was announced in the Press at the time. Thus on 22 April 1950 the Soviet Press published an official *communiqué* of the Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union (TASS) announcing the completion of the repatriation of Japanese prisoners of war from the Soviet Union. It was made clear in that *communiqué* that the Soviet authorities had completed the repatriation of the remaining Japanese prisoners of war.

59. In reply to the false statements repeatedly made by official circles in the United States and Japan and all kinds of false reports published by the Press of certain countries concerning Japanese prisoners of war in the Soviet Union, a TASS *communiqué* which was published in the Soviet Press on 9 June, stated once again that the repatriation of Japanese prisoners of war from the USSR had been completed.

60. The repatriation from the Soviet Union of German prisoners of war has also long since been completed. It will be remembered that a TASS *communiqué* dated 4 June 1949 revealed that, by the end of 1948, the overwhelming majority of German prisoners of war had been repatriated to Germany from the Soviet Union. It should also be remembered that on 5 May 1950 the Soviet Press published a TASS *communiqué* which stated: "The last group of prisoners of war, numbering 17,538 men, has now been repatriated to Germany. The repatriation of German prisoners of war to Germany from the Soviet Union has thus been completed."

61. It is obvious that the TASS *communiqués* of 22 April and 5 May 1950 completely exhaust the question of the repatriation of prisoners of war from the Soviet Union. The question is therefore pointless and there is no problem to be discussed at this session of the General Assembly.

62. The delegation of the Soviet Union insists that the proposals for the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly should be rejected and will vote against the proposal of the General Committee on this matter.

63. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The question of the repatriation of prisoners of war, submitted to the General Assembly by the delegations of Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States, is one which has for several years been used by Anglo-American propaganda for slanderous fabrications against the Soviet Union. This lying propaganda claims that the USSR is delaying the repatriation of Japanese and German prisoners of war.

64. It is obvious, as was rightly pointed out by the representative of the Soviet Union, that the submission of this question is contrary to Article 107 of the United Nations Charter, which precludes the consideration of such questions by the United Nations.

65. As has already been pointed out, the repatriation of German and Japanese prisoners of war from the USSR was completed a considerable time ago. Exhaustive official information has been published on that subject in the Soviet Press, and a full and detailed report on the completion of the repatriation of German and Japanese prisoners of war was given in the TASS *communiqués* dated 22 April, 5 May and 9 June 1950.

66. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR therefore supports the USSR proposal for the exclusion of this item from the agenda as one which is wholly contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and furthermore, for the reasons I have indicated, completely pointless.

67. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If there are no other comments, I shall put to the vote item 67, reading "Complaint of failure on the part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to repatriate or otherwise account for prisoners of war detained in Soviet territory".

Item 67 was placed on the agenda by 43 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

Items 68 and 69 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

68. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of China to speak on the inclusion in the agenda of item 70, "Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America".

69. Mr. LIU (China): My delegation is against the inclusion in the agenda of item 70. My Government knows of no aggression by the United States against China. There is no *prima facie* case against the United States; not even the flimsiest evidence can be adduced for the charge made by the Soviet Union. All of us here know and all the world knows that no aggression has been committed by the United States against China. In fact, all those who have eyes with which to see and ears with which to hear know full well that the charge of the USSR against the United States is totally unfounded.

70. It is quite understandable that the delegation of the United States has seen fit to support—or favours—the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the fifth session. The United States Government may have deemed it necessary to defend its good name against this unfounded charge. We can understand that the United States does not object to a discussion of this subject in the General Assembly but that does not mean that the General Assembly will not have to pass judgment on the matter itself.

71. If unfounded charges of this kind were admitted to the agenda, the attention of the General Assembly would be diverted from questions which at this moment occupy it. We all know that at this session the Assembly has such a heavy agenda before it that it has absolutely no time to take up unfounded charges of the kind that have been brought by the Soviet Union against the United States. For this reason my delegation will vote against the inclusion of item 70 in the agenda.

72. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As the delegation of China has raised objections, I must put the question of the inclusion of item 70 in the agenda to the vote.

Item 70 was placed on the agenda by 31 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

PART II

73. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): On the proposal of the Secretary-General, the General Committee recommends the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and a Joint Second and Third Committee on which each Member State may be represented by one person, as provided in rules 96 and 100 of the rules of procedure. As you know, this is not a new recommendation, but a tradition which we have been following for several years.

The recommendation of the General Committee was adopted without discussion.

PART III

74. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The General Committee first recommends that certain items should be considered at the plenary meetings of the Assembly. I shall not mention the recommendations on the first sixteen items, because they are all questions which have always been discussed by the General Assembly without being referred to a Committee.

75. The General Committee's next recommendation concerns items 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21.

The recommendations of the General Committee concerning items 17, 18 and 19 was adopted without discussion.

76. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call upon the representative of Israel to speak on item 20, namely, "Permanent invitation to the Arab League to attend sessions of the General Assembly".

77. Mr. EBAN (Israel): The delegation of Israel did not oppose in principle the inclusion of the Syrian item in the agenda. It is high time that a full, detailed and revealing discussion of the history, the record, the objectives and the composition of the Arab League took place in the clear light of an international forum, away from the darkness and secrecy which habitually enshrouds the deliberations of the Arab League.

78. In the course of this discussion we shall express our firm opposition to the substance of the Syrian proposal. I now rise only to discuss the procedural recommendation contained in the report of the General Committee. The General Committee has proposed that the Syrian item, entitled "Permanent invitation to the Arab League to attend sessions of the General Assembly", should be considered in plenary meeting without prior discussion in any Committee. My delegation opposes this recommendation and urges the submission of the Syrian item to the Sixth Committee prior to its consideration in plenary meeting. It would perhaps be appropriate on any strict reading of our rules of procedure for this item not to be considered at all, for rule 20 reads:

"All items proposed for inclusion in the agenda shall be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum and, if possible, by basic documents or by a draft resolution."

79. The General Assembly will notice that this rule is drafted in mandatory form—"all items . . . shall be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum"—and indeed, all governments which have proposed new items for the agenda have complied with this rule, either on their own initiative or following correspondence with the Secretary-General. The only exception is the Syrian item, in respect of which no explanatory memorandum has been submitted. I therefore wish to inquire on a point of order on what authority rule 20 can be suspended in favour of the Syrian item.

80. But the main motive of our desire to see this item discussed in an appropriate Committee is the conviction that important principles of United Nations policy are involved in what ostensibly might appear as a matter of trifling importance.

81. There is no analogy between this item and the other four items which it is proposed to discuss in plenary meeting. Two of those items, "Convention on declaration of death of missing persons" and "International control of atomic energy" have been discussed in many Committees during previous sessions, so that we have here no evasion of the procedure laid down in rule 66. The Secretary-General's memorandum on a twenty-year programme for peace covers a wide variety of subjects and is not therefore capable of reference to any single Committee.

82. But no such reason for exceptional treatment exists in the case of the Syrian item. The Syrian item is not uncontroversial. It is going to be strenuously contested. Many intricate questions are here involved.

83. Is it proper for the United Nations to recognize a body which is composed not on a geographical, regional basis within the meaning of Article 52 of the Charter, but on the basis of racial exclusiveness, leaving out the non-Arab States of the Near East and thus stunting and distorting the entire conception of the Middle Eastern region? Does the constitution of the applying body, drawn up before the Charter of the United Nations was ratified, conform to the Charter or contain reference to it? Does the record of the Arab League in launching war in defiance of the United Nations recommendation and in compelling its members under pain of expulsion not to make peace in 1950 conform or conflict with the basic objectives of the United Nations in the Middle East?

84. If the application is put forward on grounds of courtesy, is it proper to invite the Arab League here on grounds of courtesy before it has accepted an obligation to invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations to meetings of the Arab League, as is the practice with the Organization of American States, the only body to which the privilege of a permanent invitation has so far been accorded?

85. Indeed, what is the effect on the Syrian proposal of the fact that in every material respect the Arab League is the precise antithesis of the Organization of American States, in the principles of its composition, in the secrecy of its deliberations, and in the non-pacific nature of its objectives? Surely it must be of some significance that the Arab League lacks every single attribute which have rightly led to the universally approved issuance of a permanent invitation to the Organization of American States.

86. These and many other issues of substance will be raised by my delegation in the course of this discussion. I submit that the place for so detailed a discussion in the first place is not in the Assembly but in the Sixth Committee, where constitutional questions are habitually discussed by leading juridical authorities of all delegations.

87. I note that the Secretary-General's original recommendation was for the allocation of this item to the Sixth Committee. I therefore propose that the General Committee's recommendation should not be accepted, and that the Secretary-General's original proposal for reference to the Sixth Committee should be adopted instead.

88. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The purpose of the Israeli representative's proposal is to refer item 20 to the Sixth Committee before it is submitted to the Assembly. As no one has spoken against the inclusion of this item I hope future speakers will give us their views upon it.

89. Mohamed SALAH-EL-DIN Bey (Egypt): I have very few words to say. Just to prove to the delegation of Israel and to the Assembly that the Arab League has nothing to hide, nothing to fear, and that the Arab countries are confident that they are peace-loving, I agree with the representative of Israel that the matter should pass first to the Sixth Committee.

90. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall put to the vote the proposal that item 20 should be referred to the Sixth Committee.

The proposal was adopted by 37 votes to 2.

91. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I wish to give the Assembly a few explanations in connexion with item 21. The item is entitled "Development of a 20-year programme for achieving peace through the United Nations". This is a vast programme, covering a number of matters. The General Committee's proposal does not rule out the possibility of the General Assembly referring one or more items to the appropriate Committee, if it deems necessary. I thought it my duty to draw your attention to this point.

The General Committee's recommendation concerning item 21 was adopted without discussion.

The General Committee's recommendations concerning the allocation of agenda items to the First, Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth Committees, to the Ad Hoc Political Committee and to the Joint Second and Third Committee were adopted without discussion.

92. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In accordance with the decision taken a short while ago, we shall have to add as item 9 of the items recommended by the General Committee for discussion by the Sixth Committee the question of the permanent invitation to the Arab League to attend sessions of the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

The General Committee's recommendations concerning the items to be allocated to the Sixth Committee, thus amended, were adopted without discussion.

PART I (*concluded*)

93. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We now come back to the first part of the General Committee's report, in which it is proposed that certain items on the provisional agenda and the supplementary list which relate to the same question should be grouped together or combined under a single item.

These recommendations of the General Committee were adopted without discussion.

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 9]

SPEECHES BY MR. UNDEN (SWEDEN), MR. SIROKY (CZECHOSLOVAKIA) AND MR. URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (COLOMBIA)

94. Mr. UNDEN (Sweden): The Korean conflict has, quite properly and naturally, played an important role in this debate. The great majority of the Governments represented here consider that the war in Korea is a flagrant case of aggression on the part of North Korea, and that it is of the utmost importance for the maintenance of peace in the future that this aggression should not be successful. The Swedish Government has, among so many others, taken this position.

95. I should like, however, to dwell for a while on the opposite point of view—the one which has repeatedly been put forward in the Security Council by the representative of the Soviet Union.

96. In doing so I pass over the assertion that North Korea has been the victim of aggression on the part of South Korea since I can hardly believe that such a contention has been brought forward in earnest. Moreover, the course of events after the outbreak of the war constitutes as clear a refutation of this assertion as anybody may wish. However, a clever and more subtle argument has been put forward by the Soviet Union. It implies that the war in Korea is a civil war, and that an intervention in the fight between different Korean forces is a violation of Article 2 (7) of the United Nations Charter.

97. As is well known, that Article states that the United Nations is not authorized to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. I should like to point out that the interpretation of Article 2 (7), as presented by the representative of the Soviet Union, would mean that the United Nations Charter had raised to a legal principle the policy of non-intervention that was followed by most countries during the Spanish Civil War. The very wording of Article 2 (7) argues against such an interpretation. The Article in question makes an exception for enforcement measures under Chapter VII. Furthermore, Korea was divided into two zones of occupation which it had not yet been possible to unite into one country. The relations between North Korea and South Korea were, therefore, *de facto* very similar to those between two different States.

98. The action of the United Nations in the war in Korea has also, for other reasons, been condemned as "illegal" by the representatives of the Soviet Union. In particular it has been stressed that the United States decided upon intervention before the Security Council had considered the question. But both the action of the United States and the decisions of other countries to assist South Korea are solidly based upon the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter concerning collective self-defence. It would have been easier to understand the Soviet Union objection had the other members of the Council taken the view that the Soviet Union was obliged to take part in military defence actions against North Korea, despite the fact that its representative was not present when the Council considered the matter. The other members of the Council, however, have confined themselves to recommending all Member States to take part in the aid to South Korea. This appeal has, fortunately enough, received a very widespread response, although no legal obligation existed. In my opinion, that indicates that legalistic views are not decisive in the attitude of States in situations such as the present one.

99. In the remarkable speech delivered by the Secretary of State of the United States during this debate [279th meeting] certain proposals were outlined to strengthen the General Assembly's authority to take action for the maintenance of peace. It is natural that the United States, which so valiantly carries the main burden of the defence in Korea, should take the initiative which practical experience has proved to be necessary. The Swedish Government will carefully consider these proposals. Anything that can be done to strengthen the practical possibilities of the United Nations securing peace and preventing aggression will be favourably considered by my Government. I may, however, observe at once that we should not exaggerate the

possibilities of reaching important results through mere technical improvements in the machinery of the United Nations. The political conditions needed for the solution of our most burning political problems must be created by the policy of the Member States; they cannot be procured by mere technical methods, however perfect. During nearly two decades of activity with the League of Nations I, like so many others, was personally strongly influenced by the opinion that essential results were to be obtained in this way—the technical way—but when the machinery was tested practical experience was certainly disappointing. My delegation therefore wishes to stress the importance of the presence of such political conditions as are necessary to prevent or, as fortunately seems certain to be the result in Korea, stop aggression.

100. In connexion with the proposals put forward by the leader of the Soviet Union delegation during this debate [279th meeting], I should like to deal with two points. Mr. Vyshinsky mentioned the so-called Stockholm Appeal concerning atomic weapons as well as the proposal for an agreement between the permanent members of the Security Council, and he expressed the opinion that we could find here valuable instruments for the strengthening of peace. I must confess that I fail to see in what way the acceptance of these two points in his programme would contribute to the solution of our present problems. Could it really be possible that the peoples would be saved from the evils of war through a universal acceptance of the Stockholm Appeal? If that were the case the name of the capital of Sweden would be connected with the greatest miracle in the history of humanity. I regret to say that I consider, on the contrary, that the name of Stockholm has been used as a label for superstition. If not even the immense adherence to the Christian commandment of charity and its call for peace on earth have been able during past centuries to prevent war, how then could a general adherence to the Stockholm Appeal have a stronger effect?

101. The first two points of the Stockholm Appeal express the demand for prohibition of atomic weapons and for international control of the use of atomic energy. We all know that in principle there has been agreement in the United Nations in regard to these two demands; but we also know very well that when we examine these questions more closely strong differences of opinion arise as to the implementation of the two principles. These differences are completely concealed in the Stockholm Appeal.

102. The third point expresses the idea that the state which first resorts to the use of atomic weapons commits a crime against humanity. Even this phrasing conceals problems which should have been stated clearly and openly. Everyone agrees that aggression in itself is an international crime. If an aggressor makes use of atomic weapons, either at the time of the aggression or later when he is threatened by defeat, then his crime against humanity is even more qualified. On the other hand, if a State which has been attacked without there being any guilt on its own part should, as a last resort to save its own existence or, perhaps civilization itself, make use of atomic weapons against the aggressor, then the problem is entirely different. It is to be suspected that most of those who have adhered to the Stockholm Appeal have not even taken cognizance of

the existence of this problem or, even less, been prepared to take a stand thereon. Consequently, the third point of the Stockholm Appeal should, in order to be complete and honest, contain the following: "The state which defends itself against a criminal aggressor by making use of atomic weapons shall be considered an enemy of mankind". Many of the adherents would certainly have hesitated to give their categorical agreement to an assertion of this kind.

103. As to the other part of Mr. Vyshinsky's proposal which I have just mentioned, is it not evident that a treaty between the permanent members of the Security Council would be an instrument for the preservation of peace only if it contained agreement on the solution of important controversies between the Powers? But if the agreement were limited to general declarations of willingness to have peace and co-operation, then it would only repeat statements contained in the United Nations Charter. In the time between the two world wars, I should think more treaties of this type were concluded than at any other time in history, but they did not prevent the outbreak of the Second World War.

104. The Swedish delegation has, during the last three sessions of the General Assembly, recommended a liberal application of the rules for the admission of new members to our Organization in order to promote its universality. This is still our position, and we therefore hope that the present session will finally succeed in obtaining a positive solution of this question. Even more, we hope that those Member States which have withdrawn during the last year from the work of certain organs will return to this work in a spirit of collaboration and goodwill. As I have already pointed out in another connexion, the Swedish delegation also hopes that the question of the representation of China will be brought to an early solution.

105. This year, again, the question of the Jerusalem regime will come up for renewed consideration. A somewhat artificially composed majority adopted resolution 303 (IV) last year ordering the establishment of the Jerusalem area as a *corpus separatum* under the direct authority of the United Nations. The Swedish delegation warned against the adoption of this resolution, as we considered it impossible of implementation and, together with the delegation of the Netherlands, we submitted a proposal⁵ which seemed to us to ensure the protection of the Holy Places and at the same time provide the basis for an agreement with the interested parties. My delegation persists in thinking that a solution of this problem, so important for millions of people of different religious faiths throughout the world, must be sought along the general lines of the suggestions put forward by the two delegations.

106. In his speech, Mr. Acheson outlined a programme of economic recovery and social reforms in Korea. He expressed the opinion that land reform and material help constitute the most important conditions for the creation of a viable Korean State. I am convinced that this is a very realistic outlook which deserves all our support in the present case as well as in other similar cases.

107. As a general principle we ought to direct our

efforts—by using available possibilities—towards furthering and strengthening the co-operation which has taken place in different fields within the organs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The Swedish delegation will revert to these questions during the debate in the main committees on the different points of our agenda.

108. Allow me to finish by quoting the open letter to the United Nations from the Danish scientist, Professor Bohr—a quotation which, in my opinion, contains a deep and universal truth. In his letter Professor Bohr said:

"In the search for a harmonious relationship between the life of the individual and the organization of the community, there have always been and will ever remain many problems to ponder and principles for which to strive. However, to make it possible for nations to benefit from the experience of others and to avoid mutual misunderstanding of intentions, free access to information and unhampered opportunity for exchange of ideas must be granted everywhere."

109. Mr. SIROKY (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): On behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, I should like to express the hope that the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations may lay the foundations for the solution of all those vexed problems which are at the origin of the strained international situation, and that it may lead to their peaceful and just solution in the interests of a democratic and lasting peace.

110. Our delegation is imbued with hope, for it represents the foreign policy of a State which condemns force as an instrument of national policy in international affairs and considers that differences of economic and social structure between various regimes should not stand in the way of an international collaboration based on democratic principles. The foreign policy of our Republic seeks to achieve collaboration and good relations with all peace-loving peoples and States on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty. The policy of the Czechoslovak State is inspired by the firm determination to ensure the happiness and well-being of the people of our country. It is for that reason that we so earnestly desire peace and agreement among nations.

111. The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that the fifth session of the General Assembly has the opportunity to make a considerable contribution to the creation of the conditions prerequisite to that peaceful collaboration among the great Powers which is the key to the successful solution of all controversial international problems, and to the real defence of peace.

112. Great value must therefore be placed on the proposal of the Government of the Soviet Union [A/1376], submitted to the Assembly by Mr. Vyshinsky, "that the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, China and the Soviet Union should combine their efforts for peace and conclude among themselves a pact for the strengthening of peace". Such a step, which would be welcomed with great joy by the peoples of the whole world, could create the conditions required for the removal of the causes of the threat to peace.

⁵ See document A/1227.

113. The declaration which the USSR Government has submitted for the consideration of the Assembly contains further important and concrete proposals for the defence of peace. In the first place, it proposes the prohibition of propaganda in favour of another war. We know that on the initiative of the Government of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly as long ago as 1947 adopted its important resolution 110 (II) prohibiting all propaganda in favour of another war and calling upon governments to promote friendly relations among nations.

114. There is no need to expatiate on the value, as a step towards relieving war tension, of the prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war and the strict observance of that principle at the present time. The United Nations should apply the whole weight of its authority to prevent propaganda in favour of another war, propaganda in favour of the mass killing of people, the spreading of an ideology of war and of aggression and the stirring up of hatred between peoples and States. The governments and parliaments of the Member States, supported by the authority of the United Nations, can perform the beneficial task of enforcing, legally and politically, within their own territories, the international prohibition of propaganda in favour of another war, and calling war-mongers to strict account.

115. The Czechoslovak delegation, representing a peace-loving people and a peace-loving State, a country where war propaganda is unthinkable, besides being a penal offence, is deeply convinced that public opinion in all the Member States and among all the peoples would welcome this step with satisfaction and actively support the United Nations in enforcing the prohibition of propaganda in favour of another war.

116. Public opinion throughout the world would welcome with deep relief the unconditional prohibition of the use of the atomic weapon, the establishment of strict international control to ensure the complete and unconditional observance of that prohibition, and the affirmation that the first government to use the atomic weapon would be declared a war criminal.

117. We have seen how spontaneously the partisans of peace acted in this matter. Four hundred million people in all parts of the world, belonging to the most varied peoples and races, representing different political viewpoints and philosophies, and living in a variety of social conditions, have already combined their forces in the anti-war campaign and signed the Stockholm Appeal, which demands the prohibition of the use of the atomic weapon and requires that the first government to use that weapon should be regarded as a war criminal. On behalf of the life and happiness of all mankind and future generations, the demand is advanced that this great discovery of contemporary science should not be used for the mass destruction of peoples and the dissemination of death on a hitherto unprecedented scale, but that it should be used only in the interests of peaceful construction, an example of which is provided by the gigantic constructional works in the Soviet Union, where the unbridled forces of nature are being used in the interests of the nation.

118. It may be supposed that in the past the greatest obstacle to an agreement on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the institution of strict international control was the delusion entertained by one great Power

that it had the monopoly of atomic energy. But this delusion is contradicted by the facts. Atomic energy is not the monopoly of a single Power. Hence all the peoples throughout the world are equally concerned that the atomic weapon should be prohibited. A great responsibility lies on this fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that it should not deceive the hopes of hundreds of millions of men of goodwill and that it should be able to contribute by decisive action to the liberation of the peoples from the fear engendered by the threat of an atomic war.

119. Finally, it is proposed that the great Powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China and the Soviet Union, should reduce their present armed forces by one-third during 1950 and that the question of a further reduction should be submitted for consideration at one of the forthcoming sessions of the General Assembly.

120. There can scarcely be a more effective means of relieving war tension than a reduction of the armed forces of the five great Powers, whose military and economic potential decides in the last resort the question of war and peace and whose example would automatically make it possible for the other States Members of the United Nations to proceed to an immediate reduction of their military budgets and armed forces. The mere fact that the great Powers, acting on the basis of a legal injunction of the United Nations, reduced their armed forces, would be a serious blow to those who preach and incite to another war, and would contribute to the creation of the conditions necessary for a peaceful solution of controversial international problems.

121. Such a step would undoubtedly greatly relieve the public in those States whose military budgets are inordinately high, and in which the masses of the workers bear the whole weight of the continuing armaments race and of military preparations. The magnitude of such preparations may be clearly seen from the military budgets of the United States and of the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. Their policy is also reflected in the increase in the occupation forces in various parts of the world. Moreover, it is no longer any secret that they are pursuing a policy of remilitarizing western Germany, where the organization of a west German aggressive fascist army has been entrusted to war criminals, to the hitlerite generals.

122. It is impossible to agree with the argument that an atmosphere of confidence must be created before it is possible to talk of disarmament. We consider that the opposite is true. Disarmament creates an atmosphere of confidence. A great historical responsibility lies with the fifth session of the General Assembly in this vital matter.

123. The proposals contained in the declaration of the USSR Government are clearly concrete measures for the defence of peace and are the outcome of the consistently peaceful policy of a socialist Power, a policy based on the theory that it is possible for States with differing social and economic systems to co-exist in peace and to engage in peaceful competition.

124. The foreign policy of certain other great Powers, on the contrary, is not based on the possibility of the

peaceful co-existence and rivalry of differing economic and social systems, but on the conception of the inevitability of military conflict between them. And therefore, instead of collaboration, they are organizing all kinds of aggressive military pacts in a so-called crusade against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. This policy is the source of the present tension.

125. A way out of this situation is indicated by the proposals of the Soviet Union, which aim at collaboration between the five great Powers and the adoption of effective measures in support of peace.

126. And now, viewing the matter in the light of these principles, I shall with your permission make some critical observations on the position and proposals of the United States delegation.

127. First of all there is the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and its organs, a question on which the United States delegation has adopted an unfavourable attitude, in contrast to that of all the other great Powers.

128. It is clear that no legal or political arguments can justify a policy which denies the legal representatives of 500 million people the right to take their places in the United Nations and its organs. The views of those who connect the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations with the internal political structure of China must be regarded as particularly harmful.

129. We may fully endorse the position adopted by the representative of India [277th meeting], who demonstrated that the Central People's Government of China is the only legal government of the Chinese people, and at the same time stated that the question of the political nature of a country's regime is the domestic concern of each individual nation and has nothing to do with the question of the representation of a State in the United Nations. If we begin to act on the basis of whether or not we like the domestic arrangements and regimes of the various States Members, our discussions would scarcely be conducive to agreement and collaboration in the United Nations. They would, on the contrary, bring about the collapse of collaboration in the United Nations, for the United Nations is in fact based on the collaboration of States with differing economic and social systems and differing political regimes. I personally, for example, do not like the economic and political structure of Australia. But I do not of course conclude from that that the Australian Government cannot be represented in the United Nations.

130. An invitation to the representatives of the People's Republic of China to attend the fifth General Assembly of the United Nations would substantially enhance the importance of the Assembly's discussions and decisions and would considerably increase the general prestige of the United Nations. It cannot be considered normal that a great Asian Power, the State with the largest population in the whole world, should be excluded from the work of the United Nations, a state of affairs which diminishes the prestige and authority of the Organization. An invitation to the legal representatives of the People's Republic of China to join the United Nations would be a first important practical step towards the re-establishment of collabora-

tion between the five great Powers, a collaboration which is the basis for the legal activity of the Security Council and for an effective peace policy of the United Nations in general.

131. It may therefore be expected that the fifth session of the General Assembly will find a means to end the present unstable and irregular situation and will invite the legal representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to take part in the permanent work of peaceful collaboration.

132. Mr. Acheson, on behalf of the United States delegation, submitted proposals [279th meeting] in the form of a four-point plan. That plan calls for measures which in fact would deprive the Security Council, which is the principal organ of the United Nations, of its competence, the establishment of a so-called peace and security commission with the right of inspection "in every country", the creation of special military units in the Member States and at the same time the appointment of a United Nations military adviser.

133. It is impossible to dissociate these proposals from the general policy of the United States, which is in a process of transition from the cold war to acts of direct aggression. That, incidentally, is evident from the words of Mr. A. Barkley, Vice-President of the United States, who said on 21 May 1950 that the United States "may have to occupy more countries before the cold war is ended". Such a step might be inevitable, "so we must maintain armed forces all over the world". Clearly the Vice-President was speaking openly of the aim to achieve world hegemony and of the acts of aggression which were being prepared by the United States, such as the attacks on Korea and Taiwan.

134. That is really aggression, aggression committed by the United States against the Korean people. For the purpose of this aggression, the imperialist and militarist circles of the United States have abused the name and emblem of the United Nations, on the basis of certain illegal decisions of the Security Council. At the same time, the United States has repeatedly rejected the proposals of the Soviet Union for settling the Korean question peacefully, with the participation of representatives of the People's Republic of China and of the Korean people, proposals which have also been introduced at this session.

135. The Korean people has the undisputed right independently and in all sovereignty to decide its own fate. It has the right to decide in accordance with its own desires the question of a single and democratic government of its State. If a just and democratic settlement of this matter is to be achieved, the sovereign will of the Korean people must be respected, the bombing of Korean towns and villages must cease and the forces of occupation and intervention must be withdrawn from Korea.

136. We are also confronted with aggression committed against the People's Republic of China in the form of the landing of foreign forces on the island of Taiwan.

137. I consider that the General Assembly of the United Nations is entitled to ask under what Article of the Charter the United States forces occupied this territory, which by historical right and by the Cairo

Declaration of 1 December 1943 is an integral part of the Chinese State. If the General Assembly is assured here that the United States has no territorial ambitions and seeks no special position or privileges with respect to Formosa, one cannot but ask what the United States forces are really seeking in that territory, which is an integral part of the sovereign possessions of the Chinese State. Now, when aggression has been committed, something in the nature of a special statute is being asked for Taiwan. It is clear that, just as in the Korean question, an attempt is being made as an afterthought, to conceal aggressive acts behind the fig-leaf of international legality.

138. The establishment of a special statute for Taiwan would be an illegal act and would constitute a further flagrant interference in the domestic affairs of a foreign State, in violation of the Charter. All that is required to create a situation which would be in accordance with international law and democratic principles is to withdraw the occupation forces.

139. These facts show sufficiently clearly the real nature and purpose of the United States proposals. Their purpose is to secure a fundamental revision of the Charter so that the United Nations may become the instrument of the policy of a single Power; in that way the aggressive acts of that Power would be given at least the appearance of legality. Their purpose is to secure the use of the armed forces of the Member States on any occasion in the service of a single Power, albeit under the emblem of the United Nations. Hence the demand for the abolition of the principle of concerted action by the great Powers which is the basic prerequisite of an effective policy of peace. Hence too the demand that the Security Council should be deprived of its competence and that the Charter should be revised, which can only result in great damage to the United Nations.

140. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that the development of democratic principles in international relations, the interests of the security of nations and of international peace require, on the contrary, the strengthening and strict observance of the principles of the Charter, an instrument which is based on the principle of mutual respect and the equality of rights of peoples and States, and not on the principle that a single State Member should hold a monopoly in the United Nations.

141. The Czechoslovak delegation unreservedly accepts the binding force of the Charter of the United Nations, which was created five years ago by a humanity sickened by the horrors of war.

142. Attempts are being made to transfer responsibility from the guilty to the innocent, and to accuse the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies of violating peace and pursuing an imperialist policy.

143. What these allegations are worth can best be seen in Mr. Bevin's speech [283rd meeting]. By way of example, reference may be made to his remark about the *putsch* in Czechoslovakia, which was really a democratic and constitutional solution of the governmental crisis of 1948. But it is difficult to discuss such matters with Mr. Bevin so long as the Government of the United Kingdom speaks of the democratic solution of the governmental crisis as a *putsch*, while regarding

the fascist revolution brought about by the Munich Agreement, or *diktat*, as a legal situation. Mr. Bevin accuses the Soviet Union of violating agreements concluded during the war, but everybody knows that it was actually the United States and the United Kingdom which violated the historic agreements of Yalta and Potsdam. Mr. Bevin talks of peace, but makes bellicose declarations here and threatens war.

144. It is evident that all this slanderous propaganda accusing the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies of violating peace is calculated only to conceal and justify the military preparations and aggressive acts of the Anglo-American bloc. But the facts are stronger than slanderous propaganda. The historical facts testify that the foreign policy of the USSR and its allied States, the peoples' democracies, is characterized by an unflinching and consistent campaign against warmongers, against the policy of aggression and incitement to a new war, a campaign to secure a lasting democratic peace. The fundamental feature of this policy, which results from the very essence of the socialist State, is an unyielding and consistent effort to prevent the weakening and destruction of the United Nations, to strengthen it and to ensure the strict observance of the international obligations and principles of the Charter.

145. On the other hand, it is undeniable that the United States foreign policy is characterized by the effort to gain mastery over the greatest possible number of States, to deprive those States of the means of conducting an independent domestic and foreign policy, and to use them for the realization of its aggressive plans. The foreign policy of the United States is at this time characterized by the transition from the cold war to acts of direct aggression, the United Nations being used for that purpose. It is in this light that the United States efforts to obtain a revision of the Charter and thus to undermine the foundations of the United Nations and convert it into an instrument of its policy must be regarded.

146. Such a policy is fully confirmed by the statements of the representatives of two great Powers, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Bevin, statements which cannot contribute to relieve the strained international situation.

147. The way out of this situation can be found in the proposals made in the declaration of the USSR Government. They open the way to agreement among the five great Powers in the interests of the strengthening of peace. They show the way to the adoption of concrete measures capable of relieving the war tension, and in the end of averting the threat of war. They show a practical way of securing peace. They would strengthen the authority of the United Nations, the purpose of which is to defend the peace and security of the nations.

148. Mr. URDANETA ARBELAEZ (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): The practice of beginning sessions of the Assembly with a general debate should be recognized as affording the Governments represented here an opportunity to state early in the session their attitude on the most important items on the agenda; thus an idea may be obtained of the general outline of the proceedings of the most important organ of the United Nations, and the world, anxious to learn the views of the Assembly, can without delay, form an

opinion concerning the objectives of the Member States of the Organization and the responsibilities each one of them is prepared to assume. Accordingly, and taking into account the pressure of time, I propose to outline briefly the Colombian delegation's attitude to the main problems on the agenda.

149. There can be no doubt that the bloody drama being enacted in Korea takes first place amidst the problems which face the world and on that account must take priority over all other matters before the General Assembly. This is not only because, in that distant land, the blood of heroic servants of the United Nations is being shed, but also because, there, the prestige of our Organization is at stake and the effectiveness of aggression against law and the predominance of right over force are being weighed in the balance.

150. The position of Colombia in relation to such an important problem cannot be a matter for vacillation.

151. At the first part of the third session, our delegation stated that it would support the conclusions reached by the United Nations Commission on Korea that had gone to study on the spot the situation that had arisen there. We defined our position on the question then, even though we were not unaware of the proportions to which any conflict brought about by disregard of the Commission's conclusions might grow.

152. The Government of Colombia has followed the invariable practice of respecting the decisions of organs of the United Nations and of obeying its decisions as expressed by the majority vote of the Member States. We believe that it is by the vote of the majority that the democracies can express their will and that, whatever may be the disadvantages which this principle may offer, there is no other way for peoples to attain self-government in accordance with their own freely-expressed will. I cannot but differ on this point with the views expressed here a few days ago by the head of the USSR delegation when he repudiated the moral weight of the majority vote of the Assembly. If the decision of the majority does not determine the course to be followed by states and peoples, then there remains but one alternative: to impose the will of the armed minority upon the unarmed majority. This course, far from leading to peace, leads to slavery.

153. Colombia, accepting, therefore, the Security Council's decision to come to the aid of Korea, even by recourse to arms as well as the recommendation that all Member States of the Organization should co-operate in this effort, replied to the Secretary-General's telegram of 14 July⁶ by stating that it was prepared faithfully to fulfil its international commitments, whatever sacrifices might be involved. Consequently, Colombia has recently placed at the disposal of the Unified Command of the United Nations a frigate, the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of which are ready to proceed to the theatre of war and are prepared to give up their lives at the side of their comrades from other countries in the cause of the United Nations. It is with a heavy heart that Colombia sees her sons departing; but at the same time it is with a feeling of satisfaction because they are going to discharge their duty.

154. Already in the opening meeting of this session

of the Assembly, the question of the delegation of China was brought up and it was debated which of the two Governments, the People's Republic or Nationalist China, should occupy a seat in our Organization. My delegation's attitude to this important question is as follows: the Nationalist Government had been unanimously recognized, even by those who today oppose it, as the legitimate government of the Chinese people and no one ever questioned the legitimacy of the credentials of its delegation. Then there occurred a subversive movement which, with arms supplied by foreign countries, fought to overthrow that legitimate government and which, after a long and varied series of events, succeeded in winning the upper hand, although it cannot be said that the battle is finally over. What I should like to know is at what precise moment the legitimate government ceased to be the legitimate government and at what point the one which sought to overthrow it by force acquired a legal and moral right.

155. I have heard it said here that the fact that the Government of the People's Republic is now in control of most of Chinese territory and imposes its decisions on the majority of the Chinese people, provides it with sufficient credentials as a legitimate government which should be recognized and respected by the international community, and that the Government of Nationalist China, which was legitimate until quite recently, ceased to be legitimate because today it is confined by force of arms to the territory of Formosa.

156. Nevertheless, I find that those who maintain this thesis have on many occasions applied different principles. To mention only a single case, I give the example of the present Government of Poland whose members for a long time resided outside their country without even setting foot on Polish territory. Yet, that was the Government which was recognized as legitimate and which later imposed its authority by force of arms. Nor is it idle to recall that in the case of Spain there is a government which for many years has completely and peacefully ruled the entire territory of Spain and is obeyed by all of its inhabitants. Nevertheless the legitimacy of this Government is not recognized by the very people who here advocate the immediate recognition and admission of the People's Republic of China.

157. We must not forget in this instance that the maintenance of peace is the primary objective of the United Nations and that the first duty of the Organization is to strive for peace. But the internal peace of states is an integral part of international peace and it does not seem to be conducive to the strengthening of internal peace to promote from within or outside this Organization revolutionary movements designed to overthrow legally constituted governments. To expel from the United Nations, without careful consideration, the delegation representing the government which heretofore was unanimously recognized as the legitimate government of China, and which is still struggling to maintain its authority, and to invite the representatives of the subversive movement would, in my opinion, be tantamount to inciting people to sedition everywhere in the world and thereby weakening the foundations of international peace.

158. In the case of Jerusalem, the position of the Colombian delegation is well known. As the representatives of an overwhelmingly Catholic people, we desire a re-

⁶ See document S/1619 and S/1641.

gime which will offer complete safeguards for the Holy Places and ensure free access for the faithful of all religions. The General Assembly resolution providing for the internationalization of the Holy City is still in force and Colombia respects it. We hope that in its application an attempt will be made to find a solution which can be supported by the inhabitants of both nationalities. We are prepared to exert our efforts to that end.

159. Colombia has no links and no direct interest in the territories of the former Italian colonies. This fact has enabled my country to take an impartial attitude during the discussions of their future status and our sole preoccupation has been to ensure respect for the general principles for which my country has always striven.

160. When the government of Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, Colombia was one of the first countries to vote in favour of the sanctions ordered by the League of Nations, and although the great Powers later accepted the *fait accompli* of annexation, Colombia always refused to recognize it. The countries of America regard as unacceptable any annexation carried out without consultation of the people and against their will.

161. One year ago there was some doubt concerning the possibility of setting up an independent state in Libya within the brief period stipulated in General Assembly resolution 289 (IV). It now appears that despite the numerous problems which will have to be faced, it will be possible to convene in the coming year a constituent assembly, and that before 1 January 1952 Libya will enter the family of nations as a sovereign, free and independent state.

162. The report of the Advisory Council on Somaliland shows the wisdom of the General Assembly in making Italy responsible for that territory's administration during the three years which were considered necessary for its preparation as an independent state.

163. It remains for the Assembly to solve the problem of Eritrea. Annexation to Ethiopia, carried out against the wishes of large sections of the population, would be a violation of principles on which we can brook no compromise. On the other hand, in view of the special characteristics of the territory and the division of opinion which has been reported by the United Nations Commission for Eritrea,⁷ it would be premature to consider the establishment of an independent state and dangerous to postpone a decision on the fate of so important a territory.

164. Perhaps a solution might be found in the proposal for federation which is supported in some quarters, but only provided that the statute of such a federation respect the sovereignty to which each member State of a federation is equally entitled. There can be no federation if the essential attributes of domestic sovereignty are vested in only one of the member States.

165. Colombia is particularly interested in the success

of the programme of technical assistance to economically under-developed countries which was initiated, with wisdom and foresight, by President Truman in Point Four of his inaugural address. The struggle against poverty and the determination to raise the standard of living of those who have been less favoured by fortune are, in our opinion, essential prerequisites to the establishment of peace with justice. In my country, at the present time, a long-term programme is being initiated under the auspices of the United Nations and its technical organs, an undertaking which may be called the first experimental step in the comprehensive humanitarian programme of assistance to under-developed countries; if it is successfully completed, it will reflect immeasurable credit upon our Organization. My Government is resolved to collaborate to the limit of its resources in carrying out this important plan, in which the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and a group of experts, headed by the distinguished economist Laughlin Currie, have participated and taken an interest.

166. The representative of Chile [281st meeting] has already spoken at length on the development of Point Four of President Truman's programme, a statement with which my delegation heartily concurs.

167. Finally, I should like to comment briefly on the trend of opinion which exists here to give greater flexibility to the action of the General Assembly in the solution of international disputes, particularly in cases where the Security Council is paralysed owing to the rigidity of its rules of procedure. My country feels that this is a wholesome tendency. It coincides with the views we have held since the San Francisco Conference; and we have often expressed the opinion that under its rules the Security Council would frequently be found lacking in effectiveness. Events have confirmed our prognostications, but we cannot agree that this deficiency will lead to the complete collapse of our Organization. We feel that the Charter should not be looked upon as a dead or static instrument, but as one imbued with life and capable of development to enable the organs of the United Nations to carry out their functions and meet the exigencies which may arise.

168. I should like to conclude my remarks by expressing my delegation's heartfelt hope that this session will be a successful one, and that the great Powers will reach an understanding despite the differing principles which govern the lives of their peoples. They all, surely, seek the happiness of their peoples, but it is inconceivable that they should contemplate the destruction of man in order to attain that goal.

169. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): There are no other speakers listed for this afternoon. Most of those who wished to speak, being members of the Security Council, are attending the Council's meeting.

Unless anyone else wishes to speak, I shall now close the meeting. The next meeting will be held tomorrow at 10:45 a.m.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p. m.

⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 8.*